#### <u>REMARKS</u>

The present paper is filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1. 114 and responds to the outstanding Ex Parte Quayle Office Action mailed March 20, 2003.

#### A. <u>Disposition of Claims 109-111</u>

In the March 20, 2003 Office Action, claims 109-111 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Applicant respectfully requests that these claims be reinstated. As stated in remarks accompanying applicant's amendment filed March 3, 2003, claim 109 corresponds to original claim 29 rewritten to be in independent form. Original claim 29 was previously examined and rejected only under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. New claim 109 addresses the Section 112 rejection and, as the substance of this claim was previously examined, is not directed to a non-elected invention. New claim 110 depends from claim 109 and corresponds to original claim 30, which was also previously examined and rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. New claim 110 addresses the Section 112 rejection. Claim 111 corresponds to claim 31, rewritten to be in independent form. Claim 31 was previously objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to be in independent form. For the foregoing reasons, claims 109-111 should be reinstated and allowed.

# B. Response to the Disposition of the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

The IDS indicated in the March 20, 2003 Office Action to have been filed on 3 March 2003 (actually filed on December 2, 2002) was not considered as failing to include a statement under 37 C.F.R. § 1. 97(e). Applicant submits herewith a new IDS including the references filed in the December 2, 2002 IDS, along with reference filed previously on March 20, 2003 in another supplemental IDS, along with additional materials.



## C. Response to the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-35 and 108 were previously indicated to be allowed and have not been amended in this response.

### D. <u>Conclusion</u>

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 287-3257.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP

Date: May 20, 2003

lohn M. Wechkin

Registration No. 42,216

## **Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 583-8888

